

685. g. 8
3

A N S W E R S

TO SOME

CRITICAL STRICTURES,

RELATIVE TO THE CONTROVERSY ON

THE AUTHENTICITY OF

THE PARIAN CHRONICLE.

IN A LETTER

TO THE REV. J. ROBERTSON,

AUTHOR OF A DISSERTATION ON THAT SUBJECT.

BY JOHN HEWLETT,

OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; AND
LECTURER OF ST. VEDAST'S.

———“ Eheu,
“ *Quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam!*”

Hor.

L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR J. EDWARDS, IN PALL-MALL.

MDCCXXXIX.

A N S W E R S

TO SOME

CRITICAL STRICTURES

RELATIVE TO THE COMPLETIST OR

THE AUTHENTICITY OF

THE PARLIAM. CHRONICLE

IN A LETTER

TO THE REV. J. ROBERTSON

BY JOHN HEATLEY

OF MIDDLETON, CHURCH, & MINISTER

OF MIDDLETON, CHURCH, & MINISTER

OF MIDDLETON, CHURCH, & MINISTER

AND Z. D. N.

OF MIDDLETON, CHURCH, & MINISTER

OF MIDDLETON, CHURCH, & MINISTER

ADVERTISEMENT.

TO prevent a tedious repetition of the same references, the reader is informed, that the Strictures which are the subject of the following Letter, are to be found in a paragraph and advertisement*, that appeared in one or more of the Morning Papers, soon after the publication of the Vindication, and in the European Magazine for January, July, and August last.

* The substance of this advertisement is preserved in the Gentleman's Magazine for January last.

ANSWERS

ADVERTISEMENT.

To prevent a tedious repetition of the same references, the reader is informed, that the Notices which are the subject of the following Notice are to be found in a paragraph and advertisement, that appeared in one of the issues of the Morning Paper, soon after the publication of the "Vindication," and in the European Magazine for January, July, and August last.

* The substance of this advertisement is printed in the Gentleman's Magazine for January last.

ANSWERS

th
I
pr
a
ter
ha
th
wh
my
mi
and
you
real
mo

ANSWERS

TO SOME

CRITICAL STRICTURES, &c.

SIR,

I BEG leave to address the following remarks to you, as the person who will probably be the most *interested* in perusing them. Besides, as I do not pretend to the literary importance, or prudent reserve, which induced a JOHNSON and a HUME to treat their opponents with contemptuous silence, or affected indifference; you have a sort of CLAIM to my correspondence, from the paragraphs, advertisements, and letters, in which you have thought proper to notice me, and my late publication. However, therefore, you might have degraded yourself in my opinion, and in the opinion of some who RESPECTED you, by your illiberal attacks, you shall have no reason to complain of the most painful of all mortifications, SILENT contempt.

B

On

On a subject of recondite learning, when a person of your profession, your CANDOR, and your years, charges another, in the most positive and direct terms, with ignorance, absurdity, and gross misrepresentation, the public, if not enabled to judge for themselves, are willing to admit the truth of the accusation; and without reflecting on the harshness of the grave critic, who, after having served three APPRENTICESHIPS to his profession*, deliberately brings it, hastily condemn the folly and temerity of the writer, who could subject himself to such mortification and disgrace.

Now, as many of my fellow-creatures, whose good opinion I chiefly respect, are not capable of judging of the PROFUNDITY of your learned criticisms, this letter may serve to give them some further light into the dark controversy between us, and, at the same time, discharge the peculiar obligations which I owe to you.

I shall notice ALL your complaints, and plead to all your accusations. When I have gone through the whole, however satisfactorily I may vindicate my former publication, I do not expect from you, any concessions of opinion in my favour, or any abatement of your anger: no, it is from

* Was it not one and twenty years that you told us you were a Critical Reviewer?

very

very different motives, that I CONDESCEND to notice the hasty strictures of sneering insolence, and shall endeavour to wipe away the malevolent aspersions of disappointed vanity.

But before I begin, let me freely confess the two errors which you embraced the earliest opportunity of pointing out, respecting VITERBO and VALESIVS. I *did* give reason to suppose, that I had forgotten Viterbo was in Italy; and that I had confounded in my imagination, the commentator and editor of EXCERPTA ex POLYBIO, &c. with the heresiarch of the same name.

You are at liberty to call these mistakes hallucinations, inaccuracies, blunders, or whatever you please; and it is of little consequence to me, whether you consider them as arising from casual inadvertency and haste, or general ignorance and stupidity. I am by no means anxious about YOUR opinion on the subject, convinced that every man of SENSE will say,

——— non ego paucis

Offendar maculis, quas aut INCURIA fudit,

Aut humana parum CAVIT natura.

I congratulate you, however, on the additional strength which your DOUBTS must have received from the detection of these IMPORTANT errors;

but I likewise congratulate myself, that a mind irritated by all the rage of hostile criticism, and all the resentment of mortified pride, could not find something of still greater consequence.

Yet give me leave to observe, that you should by this time have learnt, at least, the prudent lesson of doing by your neighbour, as he has done by you. When you were guilty of that strange oversight respecting the order of the twelve cities of Ionia, I did not immediately conclude, that you were grossly ignorant of the rule of permutation; and even though some of the long sums in addition*, which you had to perform in the indices of FABRICIUS, and *you know where*, were not quite right, yet I did not rashly infer, that you were totally ignorant of Arithmetic. I am rather inclined to suppose, that you can add and subtract; nay, even multiply Olympiads by four, and reduce them to common years.

After having pleaded guilty to both these charges, I shall proceed to answer the miscellaneous accusations that follow. The first is relative to HERODIAN's little tract de NUMERIS. I had called this short fragment "an obscure treatise†;" and added, that I BELIEVED it was difficult to procure, at the time of the publication of the Parian Chronicle.

* See Dissertation, p. 110. † Page 47 Vind.

In the first place, you make me assert for a fact, what I only BELIEVED on the modest ground of probability; but this is a TRIFLE.—I shall lay before you the reasons which made me hazard that OPINION. Had it been “WELL KNOWN,” as you affirm, the book in which it was first published, and in which only it was to be found for many years, would certainly have appeared in most of the extensive Bibliothecas published about the middle, and towards the latter end of the seventeenth century: but it is not in the Bibliotheca Telleriana, published at Paris, 1693; nor in the Bibliotheca Lipenii, 1682. It is not in the Catalogus Lib. Bibliothecæ Amstelodam. printed 1622; nor in that of the Bibliotheca Lugd. Batav. 1640; nor in the catalogue of the Bibliotheca Mediceæ Florentiæ, 1641; nor in the Bibliotheca Angelica in Ædibus Augustinianis, Romæ, 1608; nor in the Bibliotheca Barberina, 2 Vol. Fol. 1681, Romæ. It was not in the Cottonian Library, when the Parian Chronicle was first published; nor is it at present in the library at the British Museum, at Sion-College, or Somerset-house. I finish this long list of catalogues and bibliothecas, which might easily be extended, by informing you, also, that it was not in the Bodleian catalogue of printed books, published 1674, by Tho. Hyde, the librarian.

But what confirmed me in my opinion that it was a scarce book, and but little known, was the assertion of the illustrious C. Gefner, who in his learned and elaborate Bibliotheca, speaking of HERODIAN'S Grammatical Tracts, says, "HERODIANI Grammatica Opuscula, de Magno Verbo, et alia quædam *δύσευγέλα* in Italia extant MANUSCRIPTA." Among the alia quædam, *δύσευγέλα* "some others difficult to be found," therefore, he must have classed the Fragment de NUMERIS. This remark was continued by the learned Josias Simler, in the second edition, which was "in duplum aucta;" and in the third, still enlarged and improved by John and James Frisius, 1583.

In the Etymologicon Magnum, though the references to the different places where Herodian is mentioned, occupy a whole folio column, closely printed, in Sylburgius's Index, yet there is no notice whatever taken of the De Numeris Tractatus; whereas all his other grammatical tracts, or nearly all of those whose titles are to be found, are mentioned by name.

It is remarkable, also, that the learned and accurate KÜSTER, in his valuable edition of SUIDAS, when enumerating the works of Herodian, mentions his Prosody, his Treatise de Magno Verbo, and other works, but takes no notice of the little Tract De NUMERIS. But you tell me that "it had

had been inserted in SEVERAL WELL-KNOWN publications, and might have been found by any school-boy in SCAPULA's Lexicon."

You ought to have known, Sir, that Scapula's Lexicon contains nothing but an EXTRACT, not from the original, but from the Latin TRANSLATION of Stephens! And so far is IT from being found in Scapula, that he has omitted the very part which I chiefly wanted to see. Who could learn from Scapula, whether it was a mode of numeration adopted BEFORE, or after, the date of the Parian Chronicle? Selden gave me the information I wanted, by telling me on the authority of Herodian, that it was "ANTIQUISSIMA numerandi formula." From the copy in Stephens's Thesaurus, indeed, I might have learnt the same, and that these Numerals were used in the time of Solon; but Selden was before me, and writing on the same subject; and where was the mighty crime in quoting the commentator instead of the lexicographer?

But you inform the public, that, "IT had been inserted in SEVERAL WELL-KNOWN publications." I am not ashamed to confess, that I know of no other publication whatever, in which the Treatise de Numeris had THEN been inserted, or is now to be found, except the folio edition of Gaza's Grammaticæ Introductiones, de

Mensibus Opusculum, &c. published by Aldus, so early as 1495. This was about 130 years before the discovery of the Parian Chronicle; and that this was a scarce book long before that time, there needs no other proof, than that it had entirely escaped the notice of such men as C. Gesner, Simler, and Frisius, when they were professedly engaged on the subject of BIBLIOGRAPHY; and that it is not to be found in any of the Catalogues or Bibliothecas that have been mentioned.

The transcript of this fragment on Numerals, in Stephens's *Thesaurus*, might have been easily buried or overlooked in the huge mass of miscellaneous matter that is crowded into his fourth volume†; particularly when we consider that the work, however common now, was THEN but in very few hands; that it was superseded by the abridgment, which was basely and treacherously published by Scapula; and was so far from defraying the expences, even of printing, that we find it was the means of impoverishing the

† That this really was the case, appears from the silence of Simler, Frisius, Kuster, and others, who might have been expected to have noticed it. Not having seen Aldus's book when I wrote the *Vindication*, I confess I did not know that Stephens had printed an ENTIRE copy of the *Tractatus* in his *Thesaurus*; for as the beginning shewed it to be a FRAGMENT, I thought he had only given an extract from the original in Aldus's Collection.

author's

author's family*. The collection in which it first appeared, could not have been a popular book, when the Parian Chronicle was discovered, because it contained no novelty, except the *De Numeris Tractatus*; and that I BELIEVE, had never been transcribed, quoted, or even mentioned by any writer before, or after (except by Stephens and his plagiarists) 'till made use of by Selden, to illustrate and confirm the antiquity of the Parian Chronicle†.

Thus, I have fairly stated, the facts that made me hazard an opinion, which has given you so much offence, and such frequent causes of triumph over my ignorance. The public will now determine with what justice you have attacked me so repeatedly on this subject, and how far I

* Maittaire, in Vit. Steph.

‡ Though the numerals had been explained by Amerotius, who wrote on the Greek Dialects, and died 1560 [Konig: Bibl.] no mention was made of their antiquity, or of Herodian's Tract. At the late doctor Askew's sale, there was a copy of Aldus's book, of which doctor Harwood remarks, "this VERY RARE book was purchased by Mr. Mason for 5l. 10s." I was therefore much surprized to find, that the copy in the valuable library of Pinelli, sold for only 16s. and it seems, you, Sir, had the good fortune to purchase it. On opening this treasure, you thought proper to alter the bold assertion, that "IT had been inserted," &c. to "the SUBSTANCE of IT," &c. but even in this you have multiplied your mistakes with regard to Stephens, for he reprinted the WHOLE of it.

was

was authorized in supposing the fragment in question an OBSCURE production.

Before I quit this subject, I must remark, that one of your advocates, (I hope not yourself) wonders that you had not produced MY argument from the numerals on the Chronicle, in support of YOUR hypothesis. This gentleman seems to think, that these numerals were not used long before the time of Herodian, or perhaps, that they were INVENTED by him; and that the author of the Parian Chronicle, therefore, was guilty of anachronism in adopting them; for he remarks, " Herodian lived about 400 years AFTER the date of the Parian Chronicle." I do not see, Sir, how the argument can apply in any other form. Perhaps you will profit by this friendly hint, and give us such a concatenation of doubts, cautions, and argumentations, as will at once turn the scale of controversy in your favour.

Against all that can be said on this unexplored subject, however, I can only urge, what I think, two probable considerations. 1. A skilful fabricator would not have forged a set of numeral characters that were not authorised by one single precedent at that time extant, either on marbles, in books*, or in manuscripts. 2. He

* Herodian did not use these numerals, he only EXPLAINED them.

would not have looked for authority in the little obscure fragment of Herodian, but would have copied the general form of numeration, which the elaborate collections of marbles and inscriptions exhibited. I find it necessary to state this application of the argument, because it is my lot to deal with men, who, when two ideas are laid before them, either from perverseness WILL not, or from another cause CANNOT, by comparison, deduce a THIRD.

I must now consider with what justice you urge the charge of ignorance against me, and back it with such a long list of names as I am afraid to copy, lest it should bring on me the accusation of plagiarism, for asserting, that "very few men, since the revival of learning, have been capable of executing such a literary monument as the Parian Chronicle." In support of this opinion, I hinted at the labour and expence of the undertaking, the very great danger of detection, considering the length of time necessary to cut the characters, the probability of many persons being privy to it, and the difficulty of imposing such a forgery on a man of Mr. Petty's character. In addition to this, I mentioned also the classical purity of the style. But if you think I meant to confine the difficulty merely to STYLE, you mistake me. Some FEW, not a MULTITUDE, of

of the long list of learned men you enumerated, might have been capable of writing a short system of chronology like the Parian Chronicle, in good Greek. I mean GOOD, as far as relates to the rules of general grammar. But the difficulty, Sir, was in writing the Greek of that particular period, and no other; in not anticipating the use of words and names of places, which furnished doctor Bentley with such irrefragable arguments in exposing the forgery of the epistles of Phalaris, though evidently written by a Greek sophist. Besides, we must consider the imminent danger there would have been in departing occasionally from every known system of chronology, without being palpably convicted of imposture. If, considering ALL these circumstances in their full extent, you still believe that there were a MULTITUDE of writers in the sixteenth, and the former part of the seventeenth century, amply qualified for the composition of the Parian Chronicle, I can only say, that I humbly claim the privilege of differing from you in opinion, without the imputation of ignorance, or absurdity.

You complain very grievously of my quoting so largely from the Dissertation, and charge me with the art of book-making. As to the first, I thought I was following the examples of the best controversial writers, treating you
with

with fairness and liberality, and avoiding, as much as possible, the danger of misrepresentation, when I embraced every opportunity of making you speak for yourself. As to your second accusation, you very much mistake my character, if you suppose that I thought the present controversy between us, would be productive of any PECUNIARY advantages. No, Sir; I put the manuscript of the Vindication into the hands of my publisher, without receiving, or expecting to receive, a penny for it. You think me guilty of shameful plagiarism, in copying your English translation. But is a literal translation of a chronological table from the original Greek, fairly printed, with a Latin version too at hand, worth contending about? I thought not; otherwise I could have furnished one at farthest in a couple of hours. However, mine is not a LITERAL copy from yours, though you think I made a few insignificant alterations, only to make it pass for my own. Indeed, I had no such ridiculous ambition. The plain truth is this—You stated in your advertisement, that you had “followed the original *as closely as possible* ;” but this you have not done: the translation, however, was in general, sufficient for the English reader, and I did not wish to go out of my way, to find fault. But when I came to translate the parallel passages, which you produced
from

from various authors, to shew that some facts in the Parian Chronicle had been taken from them, I found it necessary also to re-translate EVERY EPOCHÆ with which they were contrasted.

From your learned and elaborate statement of facts, relative to the difference between the characters of the Parian Chronicle, and other inscriptions, as well as from your long list of impostors, you say, "you draw *no inference*." It is very unfortunate that every writer who has hitherto attempted to vindicate the authenticity of the Chronicle, should have fallen into the same mistake as myself; but, Sir, if you write whole chapters, on a subject of controversial criticism, without drawing any inference, or intending that your reader should DRAW one for you, I must beg leave to retract some of the handsome things I have said of you, as a writer. I think you had better have been silent on this subject, however fore you might have felt yourself, since it must inevitably end in contradiction: for if you recollect, you told us, that "your DOUBTS, with respect to the authenticity of the Parian Chronicle, arose from nine considerations." The first is, that "the characters have no certain or unequivocal marks of antiquity." This, indeed, you have answered yourself, in a very summary, but satisfactory manner, by saying, THERE ARE NONE. Another is, that

" the

"the literary world has been frequently imposed upon, by spurious books and inscriptions; and therefore we should be extremely cautious, with regard to what we receive under the venerable name of antiquity." These are two of your nine considerations; and as I think them all of nearly equal importance, was it not fair to conclude, that your chapters in illustration of them, contained about TWO-NINTHS of your doubts? But you tell us, that though you have formally ranged them among your general divisions, and made them the subjects of long argumentations, yet you draw NO inference from them WHATEVER. I can say nothing more on this head, but that *it is a great pity mankind cannot understand one another better.*

Let us go on therefore to something else; in which, indeed, I shall have the same cause of complaint. I observed that you had been inconsistent in your representations of the Parian Chronicle*; on which you remark, "This writer charges the dissertator with inconsistency, because he sometimes speaks of the Chronicle as a wonderful monument of ancient learning, and at other times as an erroneous system of chronology. In the former case, the author speaks on the principles, or the supposition of those who contend for its authenticity; in the latter, he expresses his own opinion." So that all the

* Vindication, p. 48.

incon-

inconsistency which I thought I had discovered, was owing to the dulness of my apprehension in not conceiving the delicacy of your irony!

“Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?”

It is some comfort, however, that I am not singular on this occasion also. But take care, Sir, while you prop one part of your tottering fabric of doubts, that another does not tumble down. In your sixth chapter, you expatiate on the imperfect state of chronology among the Greeks; and if I comprehend the drift of your argument, it is to shew the improbability of any writer in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, being able to compose such a table of epochas as the Parian Chronicle contains. You apply the argument in these words; “If Thucydides, as well as other writers, complained that there was nothing but uncertainty in the earlier periods of the Grecian history, from whence can we suppose the author of this inscription collected such a *clear, determinate, and comprehensive* system of chronology?” A little after, you express your surprise, that succeeding writers should “overlook this most considerable, most *exact*, most *creditable* author?” You argue, also, that in consequence of the dates which the Parian chronologer has been able “to ascertain, with a particularity which we scarcely find in a modern history, there could

could be no want of light, or information, no want of *parapegmata*, epochas, canons, or chronological tables: consequently the complaints of all the writers above-mentioned, and many others, which might be alleged, are groundless and absurd." This seems to have been a favourite chapter with you; but now you tell us, that these are NOT your sentiments of the Parian Chronicle; that it is NOT a clear, determinate, and comprehensive system of chronology, sufficient to remove the complaint of want of light, information, &c. but a CRUDE and INACCURATE series of epochas! What then becomes of the argument? Or if you wished that to apply to the subject in debate, and yet persist in calling the Parian Chronicle, "a CRUDE and inaccurate series of epochas," how will you avoid the charge of inconsistency?

Again, in your seventh chapter, still pursuing the same argument, you observe, "It is natural, that a short, insignificant inscription, like most of those which are preserved in the collections of Gruter, Reinesius, Gudius, Spon, and others, might have lain exposed to public view for many ages, without being particularly noticed by historians and antiquaries. BUT the Parian Chronicle," you observe, "is not a small inscription, of no importance in the republic of letters, which might have been concealed in a pri-

vate library, or a cabinet, like a volume in manuscript; BUT (observe, Sir, these are your very words) it is a CURIOUS, LEARNED, and COMPREHENSIVE system of chronology inscribed, &c." How could I imagine that a man who writes with such gravity and singular precision, was sneering all the while, "suspendens omnia naso," and cruelly sporting with his favourite argument? But be so good, Sir, as to inform us, now we are on the subject, whose sentiments you adopted, or who told you that the Parian Chronicle could not be concealed in a private library, a book-case, or a chest, as you assert, (p. 148.) The fact is, that a single chest four feet long, two feet nine inches wide, and two feet and half deep, would have concealed half a dozen such inscriptions. You force me to say therefore, what I forebore to mention, in mere TENDERNESS to your feelings, that I am FULLY convinced you never SAW the remains of the Parian Chronicle, nor ever noticed the dimensions which Selden has given of it.

I come now to an article which I cannot review without some degree of pain. I must beg leave to transcribe the passage, though you might accuse me of plagiarism and book-making. You assert, that I make the dissertator intimate, "that it was a general practice with the ancients to quote the works of their predecessors with the same accuracy

accuracy and precision as our best modern historians." Whereas you tell us, "the Differtator has ONLY observed, that it was such a common practice among the ancients to mention the works of their predeceffors, that in many books we find references to three, four, five, six, or seven hundred different authors." In the first place you have been told, that in general, the WORKS are not mentioned, but a mere list of names (particularly in Pliny) is only given, among which the author of the Parian Chronicle might POSSIBLY have been included; and I might further add, that the oldest author mentioned as a QUOTER by you, did not flourish till several centuries AFTER the date of the Parian Chronicle. But, Sir, you must excuse me, when I tell you, in plain and simple terms, that this is NOT the ONLY thing you have observed on the subject. You positively assert, p. 112, that "The ancients almost ALWAYS specified the WORKS of their predeceffors, which they had occasion to quote:" and this extraordinary remark was PREMISED, as authority for the assertion I advanced. Your misrepresentation, therefore, on the present occasion, however GROSS, could not arise from ignorance, or inadvertence; and as for every other kind of misrepresentation, I consider it in a light so truly base and degrading, that this alone would be a sufficient motive with me

to close all further correspondence between us. You perceive, therefore, that I quietly give up to you, the high privilege of having the LAST WORD*.

But before we dismiss the present subject, I will favour you with the sentiments of Pliny on it. Pliny, Sir, had occasion to consult more authors, perhaps, than any classic you can mention. He says, “*Viginta millia rerum dignarum curâ, ex lectione Voluminum circiter duum millium, quorum pauca admodum studiosi attingunt, inclusimus,*” &c†. You find, Sir, he had perused about two thousand rare volumes, which the most studious had scarcely dipt into; and how many thousand he consulted of common repute, he has not told us; but luckily he HAS given us an EXPRESS declaration,—a declaration founded on the most extensive experience, relative to the subject of QUOTATION. Commending the practice of mentioning the authors from whom a writer derives information, as ingenuous and fair, he says, “*Est enim benignum, ut arbitror, et plenum ingenui pudoris, fateri per quos profeceris.*” Now mark, Sir, what follows: “*NON, ut PLERIQUE ex iis quos attigi, FECERUNT. Scito enim*

* Should you FORCE me to break this peaceable resolution, it might lead me to compose, in imitation of POPE, “A narrative of the strange and deplorable phrenzy of the Rev. J. R.”

† In Epist. Vesp.

(attend,

(attend, I beseech you) conferentem auctores me deprehendisse a JURATISSIMIS ET PROXIMIS veteres TRANSCRIPTOS ad VERBUM, neque NOMINATOS."

Thus, Sir, you find that the generality of the writers, whom Pliny had occasion to consult, and those of highest repute, had transcribed from the ancients, WORD FOR WORD, without mentioning even their NAMES.

Let me add, that he himself, after having censured this shameful practice, and professed to avoid it, has, for the most part, only prefixed the mere NAMES of the authors from whom he collected his materials, without 'specifying their works.' His words are, "In his voluminibus auctorum NOMINA prætexui." I beg leave to inform you, also, that the most shameful plagiarists of antiquity were those who might have been expected to mention the Parian Chronicle; these were the historians and chronologers; to which may be added such collectors as *Ælian*, *Valerius Maximus*, &c.

With this body of circumstantial evidence presented to my mind, how could I regard your strange assertion, that "the ancients almost ALWAYS specified the works of their predecessors which they had occasion to quote," in any other light than "a gross misrepresentation?" But you are a POLITE man, and are offended at the strength

of the expression. It is, I believe, the harshest that escaped me in writing the Vindication ; but I meant no personal offence, and was concerned only to state the TRUTH. Admit the FACT, therefore, and you may soften the manner of expressing it to your own taste.

I shall now attend to a complaint which you have often repeated, and which seems to dwell with some pain on your mind. I said, you had misrepresented a passage in Cornelius Nepos, or asserted a fact, on his authority, which the passage referred to, did not warrant. But you observe, that Herodotus was produced as the authority on the occasion, and charge me with "dozing and oscitancy, while criticising the passage." To make amends for this drowsy negligence, I shall examine the subject with more minuteness.

The fact you wanted to establish was, that "the Parians, when besieged by Miltiades, defended themselves with so MUCH BRAVERY, that he raised the siege, and returned to Athens in disgrace." Now C. Nepos says EXPRESSLY, that it was NOT in consequence of any BRAVERY on the part of the Parians, but on account of a supposed signal that denoted the approach of the Persian fleet ; and that when this mistake happened, Miltiades was on the very point of taking the city. "Cum jam in eo esset, ut oppido potiretur." In producing authorities for your assertion, there is but

ONE mark of reference, which stands thus, at the foot of your page. § Herod. l. vi. § 133. C. Nep. in vit. Milt. § 7. Who, therefore, could suppose, that you did not mean, that BOTH authors should corroborate the ONLY fact that was necessary to be established? Admitting, however, that Herodotus gave you full authority for asserting that "the Parians defended themselves with so much BRAVERY," &c. with what view could you cite C. Nepos, who attributes the failure of the expedition to a cause entirely different? Did you mean that the historians should confute each other? or had you not read the small page in Nepos, which contains that unfortunate account? You will, I hope, excuse me for asking this presumptuous question before I take my leave of you. But, Sir, you lay on me the disagreeable necessity of telling you, that you have misrepresented Herodotus almost as much as Nepos. What instances of BRAVERY, to which you apply the magnifying particle SUCH, has Herodotus recorded of the Parians during that siege? Has he related that they burnt, or destroyed, any of the Grecian fleet? Does he mention their annoying the troops while carrying on the works, with missive weapons from the battlements? Has he recorded any of those gallant actions which we so often find recorded of the OPPIDANI, when besieged, in Cæsar,

Quintus Curtius, and other writers? Does he speak of a SINGLE sally made by the inhabitants, in order to repulse the enemy; or, in short, any ONE action that merits the appellation of BRAVERY? No; he relates that Miltiades, after having closely invested the town, sent a herald, demanding a hundred talents by way of capitulation, and threatening, that unless they paid that sum, he would not withdraw his troops till he had destroyed their city. Does this indicate that he was in any danger of being repulsed by BRAVERY? Does it not rather prove that he considered them in his power? But the narration of Herodotus seems to prove, that the Parians expected to be relieved by the Persian fleet; for he represents them as keeping close within their gates, and acting wholly on the defensive. They would not capitulate; but labouring in the NIGHT, raised the city wall to double its former height. This, indeed, is an instance of their diligence and activity, but it is no proof of BRAVERY. It rather shews that they were under the strongest impressions of FEAR. And yet this is the ONLY circumstance you can fix on for the support of your assertion. "To so much of the account," adds Herodotus, (and no more, we may reasonably conclude,) "the Greeks agree." He then relates the facts as stated by the Parians themselves; and

and here we certainly should have found their acts of BRAVERY recorded, if any had been performed; but even THEY attribute the raising of the siege, and the departure of Miltiades, to a very different cause. The narrative contains a strange and improbable account of an intrigue between Miltiades and one TIMON, an inferior priestess*; of his leaping over the wall that enclosed the temple of Ceres; his approaching the holy edifice, for some purpose or other, and his being suddenly seized with horror before the doors. The story concludes, by informing us, that Miltiades, returning the same way as he came, sprained, or broke his thigh†; or hurt himself by falling on his knees, in jumping from the wall‡.

Perhaps, Sir, you prefer this account to Nepos's: if so, I shall not attempt to alter your opinion. It is clear that Herodotus did not believe it, though he has recorded it; and it is quite sufficient for my purpose, that it contains no memorial of SUCH BRAVERY as you speak of.

The neglect, therefore, which you unkindly thought arose from ignorance, or a sort of sleepy stupidity, you might have ascribed to a lenity of

* η υποζαννα. † την μηρον σπασθηναι.

‡ Herodot. lib. vi. p. 378. edit. Gale,

disposition, which would not willingly lead me to expose two blunders, or misrepresentations, when ONE was sufficient,

But I cannot help thinking myself extremely unfortunate in my controversy with you; for whether I censure, or practise forbearance, I am equally the object of your vindictive criticism. When I wished to notice such writers as were nearly contemporary with the author of the Parian Chronicle, and afforded the slightest ground of probability to expect any mention of that literary monument, I made the following remark; "Of that age, the only remnants of literature, THAT DESERVE NOTICE, are a few epigrams and hymns of Callimachus, and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius." By cautiously stating that these were the only remains "that deserved notice on this occasion," did I not plainly intimate, that there were a few more, which could not deserve to be particularly mentioned? Indeed, Sir, there are NONE of that age, in strict propriety, "that deserve notice;" and were I to re-write that chapter, I would expunge the passage. But if you, Sir, had been the Vindicator, you would, perhaps, have gone to your Vossius and Fabricius, and from them to Photius, Tzetzes, Athenæus, &c. and collected every scrap, and every name that could have been found. This I should

should have deemed an idle and ostentatious display of learning; and almost contemptible, from the easy drudgery with which it might have been made. Yet you consider my neglect of this, in some measure, among the number of gross inaccuracies, and even absurdities, with which my book abounds. "He seems not to know," you have observed in your usual way, "He seems not to know, that we have still some valuable remains of Archimedes, Apollonius Pergæus, Eratosthenes, Antigonus Carystius, Lycophron, Aratus, Theocritus, and several others, who lived in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus."

I shall not stay to prove to you, Sir, that I had ever heard, or known any thing of these writers, not even "the common school-book, THEOCRITUS;" but content myself with observing, that the best Chronologers agree in fixing the time when Antigonus Carystius, Lycophron, Aratus, and Theocritus flourished, BEFORE the Parian Chronicle was engraved. This, therefore, was of itself a sufficient reason for not crowding my page with their names; and you must know, Sir, I have lately contracted a strong aversion to long lists of names and quotations. The only objection I think you can make to this chronology, will be to the age of Theocritus. There are three decisions on this subject; some fix the
time

time in which he flourished 285 years before Christ, some 282, and a few 262. I incline to the middle era, because supported by reputable writers; and I think on the best authorities. This is fourteen years before the Parian Chronicle was engraved. But admitting that Theocritus wrote so late as 262 before Christ, this was but one year, or at most but two, after the Parian Chronicle was engraved. Now, Sir, do not you think this too short a period for the fame of a chronological marble about three feet square, and erected in the island of Paros, to spread through Greece, at THAT time, and render it at all probable that Theocritus, or any OTHER writer, should have occasion to quote or mention it? Indeed the idea of a pastoral poet mentioning it at all, is preposterous and absurd; therefore let us proceed to Eratosthenes. The only remains of this Chronologer, if we except the casual mention of a fact on his authority in a few writers, are a table of Theban kings, and a short abstract of Chronology quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus; both these happened to be mentioned and referred to in the Vindication; so I could not have been IGNORANT of them; but I did not think it necessary to bring them forward, on THIS occasion, because what had the Parian Chronicle to do with a catalogue of the ancient kings of Thebes? And as to the short
extract

extract in Clemens Alexandrinus, not being more than the quarter of a column, I thought it too trifling to deserve notice. Besides, it should be remembered, that Clemens quotes the simple statement of Eratosthenes himself, without mentioning the authorities on which the facts were founded; though it is extremely probable there were none. I have only to consider the justice of your censure for omitting the remains of Archimedes and Apollonius Pergæus. Admitting you to be a competent JUDGE of their VALUE, and that you have long since determined the important question, whether the books of Conic Sections attributed to Apollonius, were not the production of Archimedes; I must tell you, Sir, that if there had been FIFTY such books of mathematical fragments extant, I should have thought the enumeration of them in my seventh chapter, a pedantic and ridiculous parade of learning. The books of Conic Sections, Sir, are ALL in the pure abstract style of geometrical demonstration; so likewise are the books of Archimedes on the sphere and cylinder, on the dimension of the circle, on conoids, spheroids, spiral lines, &c. ALL, Sir, except the little treatise, called *Ψαμμίτης*, or, De Arenæ Numero, which consists of about eight pages only, and was meant to shew the power of numbers; so that I should

as

as soon have expected to find a description of Alexander's horse, Bucephalus, or Alcibiades's dog, in EUCLID, as any account of the Parian Chronicle in these fragments.

Having gone through all your objections and complaints, I feel myself concerned to say something on your general charge of sarcasm, want of candor, &c. It should seem from your representations, that I had treated you with all the coarseness and malignity of an old puritan; but I am not conscious of having said any thing, that ought to have given pain to a wise and good man. Besides, Sir, I thought myself secure, in some measure, from the nature of the subject. That men would be in danger of quarrelling about matters of politics, or religion, I was fully aware; but that a controversy about the fragments of an old stone, would spring up into the most violent animosities, and be propagated from month to month, I confess, I had no conception, particularly when I considered the character of my opponent; a man who professed so much CANDOR, such a dispassionate regard for truth, and such readiness to change his opinions. But I believe the history of controversial criticism, at least for the present century, will not furnish an instance of one writer attacking another so repeatedly, with such increasing malignity,

nity, and that on such trifling provocation, as you have me. I wish, Sir, to be at PEACE, and to live in CHARITY, with all my fellow creatures. If I had used an unguarded expression, or been betrayed into any thing like malevolence, I made an apology, which I thought would have been sufficient, at the end of my book.

If your charge respecting my want of literary candor, after all, be well-founded, you should remember, Sir, that you accuse me of violating a virtue, to which I made no extravagant pretensions. I have, indeed, been led to view all OSTENTATIOUS professions of candor, with an eye of jealous diffidence. It is become the CANT-WORD of the age. I have often seen it made the flimsy disguise of scepticism, or indifference in religion; the cloak for want of principle, and decision of character, in society; and in literature, it is the glaring varnish which, a LITTLE mind striving to appear GREAT, will throw over its ignorance and weakness, its childish vanity and concealed malice. I am sparing, therefore, of professions, because I would wish to be thought sincere; and let me tell you, Sir, that next to the odious vice of HYPOCRISY in religion, I rank the wicked AFFECTATION of its more amiable virtues. Having no enmity at heart, and no wish to create malevolence, I thought I might deliver my

my sentiments with manly, but decent freedom. I saw no necessity for frittering away facts under the neutral form of queries; nor for melting down arguments, that were intended to confute, into modest scruples, or humble doubts. You, indeed, have traversed the field of criticism with the most cautious timidity, and have measured every sentence, and every phrase, by the rule of fashionable CANDOR; but, Sir, I studiously avoided tarnishing my pages with the mere SHEW of a virtue, which I have long regarded with suspicion, and which your example has taught me to despise.

But on the present occasion, also, I am particularly unfortunate, because I thought I had treated YOU, and your BOOK, with uncommon LENITY; there are certainly more errors of OMISSION, than COMMISSION, in the Vindication. I asserted, that "your learning was *sometimes* ostentatiously displayed." Had I spoken the whole truth, I should have said that it was INVARIABLY so; and that not one tenth part of the mass of facts, anecdotes, and quotations, which you have collected together, apply to the subject in debate. Had I been disposed to be illiberal and severe, I should have told you, that all your information, on classical history, seems to have been copied from indexes, and such writers as Vossius, Fabri-

Fabricius, Placcius, and Le Clerc; that you seldom appear to have consulted an original writer, but as you were directed by the reference of a critic, or a commentator, nor often then; that an industrious drudge might trace you through their pages, quoting QUOTED quotations, and always holding, as it were, "The slippery eel of science by the tail." I might have added, that an evident FEEBLENESS of mind pervades the whole; that you were proud of displaying a confused assemblage of facts, which you could neither reduce to order, or dependence; that there appears such a want of intellectual power as to render you incapable of knowing what arguments would apply, and what would not; and that the assertions advanced in one page, are often confuted in another. My fondness for sarcasm might have led me to conclude, by saying, that if a person wanted assistance, in compiling a learned work, you might be found a useful EXAMINER to consult indexes, the dates of editions, &c. and that, though you could not advance any argument beyond a DOUBT, yet you might, in general, be safely trusted to sum up a catalogue of names, or adjust the PUNCTUATION of a proof-sheet. All this might have been said, Sir, but I SPARED you.

I am happy that the order in which you deli-

D

vered

vered your remarks, is bringing this long letter to a conclusion. The last subject of any importance that I shall mention, with censure, or, to borrow your own expression, with 'some injurious animadversions,' is your learned and final decision respecting the *Treatise de CONSOLATIONE*, ascribed to Cicero by some, and to Sigonius by others; a decision, Sir, which stands recorded in that treasure of choice, and erudite criticism, the *DISSERTATION*, and will be ever preserved, for the benefit of COMMON readers, in your *MISCELLANEA CRITICA*. But you bear the palm of learning so high in one hand, and wield the rod of criticism with an air of such determined vengeance in the other, that many, I doubt not, will be shocked at my temerity, and tremble for my safety. Nor do I delude myself with the vain hope that your choler will subside; for of you, Sir, I may truly say what the timid Chalcas declared of the mighty Agamemnon in his wrath:

Κρείσσων γὰρ Βασιλεὺς, ὅτε χῶσεται ἀνδρὶ χερσὶ,
 Εἴπερ γὰρ τε χόλον γέ και αὐτὴμαρ καὶ λαπέψῃ
 Ἀλλὰ γέ και μετοπίσθεν εἶχει κόλον, ὅφρα τελεσθῇ
 Ἐν σὺνδεδισσὶν εἰοισί.

Do I not recollect also, the threatening motto, the "TURNO TEMPUS ERIT," &c. or the *NOLI ME TANGERE*, which ushered in your last proclamation!

mation ! against which, though ANOTHER had offended, yet I was made to suffer. But, alas ! Sir, you have scourged me so often, and that through the streets of public shame, that I am become quite callous. I proceed, therefore, to state the facts, in my old, offensive way, by quoting your own words.

In your admirable chapter on spurious books,—(a chapter, Sir, from which, as you “drew no inference” against the authenticity of the Parian Chronicle, you must have intended for our amusement and instruction,) you have the following remarks ; “ Among the various pieces which have been FALSELY ascribed to Cicero, the CONSOLATIO is the most remarkable. This tract made its first appearance in the year 1583, and is generally supposed to have been the work of Sigonius. There is, however,” you observe, “ an obvious and striking circumstance attending it, which alone seems to destroy all its pretensions to authenticity ; and that is, the passages quoted by Lactantius from Cicero’s real work, do not exist in the present Consolatio.” For illustrations and authority, you give us the following references ; Placcius, in his *Theatrum Pseudonymorum*. Lactan. l. iil. c. 14. 18. *Lipfii Opera*, Tom. 1. edit. Moreti, p. 411. *Clerici Art. Crit.* Tom. 11. p. 333.

Thus, Sir, is a controversy which has agitated

the learned, occasionally, for almost two centuries, settled by one lucky stroke of sagacious criticism. But in consequence of a hasty and erroneous remark *, in the Analytical Review, we are favoured with some further sentiments from you, on this subject. You observe, 1. " There are SEVERAL passages in Lactantius, and not one ONLY, WHICH DO NOT APPEAR in the work now extant, and therefore *so many proofs*, that it is not the genuine production of Cicero. 2. Any reader would suppose from the words above cited, that Bentley was the first who detected the imposture; whereas this discovery had been made, by *a considerable number of writers*, in the sixteenth century. 3. Lipsius produced the passages from Lactantius, by WHICH he PROVED the present Consolatio to be a forgery, above half a century before Bentley was born. " What consummate *ignorance* is it then," you exclaim, " to assert, &c." In reference to authorities for the confirmation of these remarks, you shew your extensive reading, and indefatigable labour in the investigation of truth; for the foot of your page is ornamented with the following names and

* " The Essay de Consolatione, by Sigonius, was rejected by Doctor Bentley, before the passage of Lactantius had proved it to be spurious."

Vid. An. Review for June.

works :

works: Riccoboni Judicium de Consolat. 1584. Jani Gulielmi adv. Sigon. Assertio. 1584. Lat. Latini Lucub. p. 188. Gothofredi notæ margin. ad Consol. Misc. Lips. Tom. vi. p. 119; and Consolat. et Fragmenta Germana, ex ipso Libro M. T. Ciceronis. Lipsii Opera Tom. 1. p. 971, 974. edit. 1675.

Your determination, therefore, Sir, is not the rash decision of an active and impatient mind, that often catches, as it were intuitively, a few leading inferences, and then jumps at the conclusion; but it is the calm result of a man who had patiently read ALL the writers of note on the subject, and established his judgment, after the maturest deliberation, on the most copious and circumstantial evidence. Indeed, Sir, to do you justice, whenever you advance an opinion, you do it with such solemnity and precision, such *apparent candor* and dispassionate regard for truth; and then you fortify yourself with such various and extensive learning, with opinions supported by such high authorities, and quotations so numerous and yet accurate, referring not only to the author and his book, but the volume, chapter, page, and even year in which the book was printed, that to question the truth of your assertions, seems like doubting the records of a public court, and to attack the works with which they are surrounded,

might appear to the GENERALITY, like a poor individual attempting to storm a fenced city : But I KNOW YOU ; and it is proper that every description of readers should know a little of you too. On the present occasion, having determined, that this should be the last piece of literary drudgery that I would ever go through on your account, I have followed your foot-steps, Sir, to borrow a simile from a learned and elegant writer, “ with the patience of Homer’s mules.” Methinks I hear you ask, with eager curiosity, “ Well, what have you discovered ? ” I shall answer with a formality and precision that will please you. I have discovered,

FIRST, That you have never read the *Essay de Consolatione*, on the spuriousness of which you have pronounced so solemn a decision.

SECONDLY, That you have never read the *Affertio* of Janus Gulielmus, nor the *Judicium* of Riccoboni, which you have referred to with such pedantic formality.

THIRDLY, That you did not understand Lipsius ;

And FOURTHLY, That you have faithfully copied Le Clerc’s ignorance and egregious blunder.

I shall substantiate these charges in as few words as possible. 1. You have never read the *Consolatio* ; for if you had, I must tell you to your utter shame

shame and confusion, that you would have found EVERY FRAGMENT in Lactantius there, and even the *Crantorem sequor* mentioned by Pliny. The passages from Lactantius are seven, which are all inserted without the least appearance of patch-work, or break in the composition. Not even the repetition of "Luendorum scelerum," &c. is forgotten, which Lactantius observed, "ITER-AVIT id ipsum postea." Lact. III. 18. These you might have seen at the end of almost every edition of Cicero's works, in the Bologna Edition of the Consolatio, or in Lipsius's first Volume, if no where else; and in reading so short a Treatise as the Consolatio, it is impossible that they should ALL have escaped your notice. 2. You could never have read the ASSERTIO of JANUS GULIELMUS; if you had, you would have found, after perusing a FEW only of his very short pages, that NOTHING preserved in Lactantius had been OMITTED, and that he thought it was EASY to introduce all the fragments in an apt and consistent manner.

You could not have LOOKED into the JUDICIUM of Riccoboni, because the passages from Lactantius are mentioned and alluded to repeatedly. Eodem ordine, quo a fragmentorum investigatoribus edita sunt, INSERTA sunt. Riccoboni Jud. p. 130. See also, p. 122, 131.

3. You did not understand Lipsius, because Lipsius never meant to say that the fragments in Lactantius were not in the *Consolatio*. After having made a few hasty strictures that are replete with pedantry, dogmatism, and insolence; after having gratified his vanity by retailing other men's insignificant remarks, in a letter to his friend, Christopher Plautinus, and indulged himself, for an hour, in the mere "HORSE-PLAY" of criticism, he added the fragments from Lactantius. His words are, "*Fragmenta Germana, ex ipso Libro M. T. Ciceronis. Quæ adjunximus ad DISCRIMEN, et ad usum Lectoris*"—*AD DISCRIMEN, et ad usum*—These were the unfortunate words which misled you; but Lipsius, Sir, in a profusion of metaphor had said of the *Consolatio*, "What can be so unlike CICERO's gold, as this LEAD*?" By the *AD DISCRIMEN et ad usum*, therefore, he meant to shew you with what distinguished lustre the few remaining jewels of the illustrious orator, sparkled in the dull and heavy mass that surrounded them. If he did not mean this, I do not think myself bound to discover his meaning. But before I quit this article, let me tell you a little more news. You inform us that this dis-

* "*Quid enim tam dissimile ab illo AURO, quam hoc PLUMBUM? Ne SIMIA quidem CICERONIS esse potest, nedum ut ille.*" Lipsii Op. Tom. I. Sub. fin.

covery of the passages from Lactantius, not being found in the *Consolatio*, had been made by a considerable number of writers; and LIPSIUS, you add, produced the passages from Lactantius, by which HE PROVED the present *Consolatio* to be a FORGERY, (I blush for you, Sir,) above half a century before Bentley was born." But what I meant to inform you of was, that Sigonius had collected and produced these passages so early as the year 1559, above twenty years before the *Consolatio* itself was published! After all, perhaps, you have never read LIPSIUS; and I might have reason to beg your pardon, because you only consulted Le Clerc's *Ars Critica*, one of your favourite books, I know. In this case, Sir, you will only share the credit of having adopted and propagated one of the most egregious blunders that ever stained the annals of criticism. After what has been said, I need only quote his own words; "*Si aliunde non constaret Consolationem Ciceronis ejus non esse, hoc unum fictam argueret, quòd insignia aliquot legantur ex eà fragmenta, apud Lactantium; quorum nec VOLA, quod aiunt, nec VESTIGIUM in hodierna Consolatione. Miror (he adds very gravely) Car. Sigonium, virum doctissimum, è cujus officina prodiisse is liber dicitur, ignorasse tanta ejus operis fragmenta extare; nam procul dubio inferuisset, si SCIVISSET.*

At

At bene est, quòd vel hinc fraus ejus, minimè certe condonanda, appareat; neque enim forte deesset ALIOQUIN febriculosus Criticus, qui ejus *γυναικίᾳ* defendere sustineret." J. Clerici Art. Crit. Tom. II. p. 381.

After having given these striking proofs of erudition, and profusely scattered your indignation and contempt, you soften into something like pity, and appear deeply concerned for the literary reputation of your countrymen. Your pathetic observation, is an honourable testimony of your patriotism. "When the LITERATI of other countries (you remark) see such indications of ignorance, in one of our most pompous LITERARY journals, they must form a very disadvantageous idea of the state of critical learning in this country." Alas! alas! might I not exclaim, when the literati of other countries see such pedantic ignorance, combined with such haughty insolence and pride, in the sage ARISTARCHUS of the age, in our REVIEWER of REVIEWS, in our great DICTATOR in the republic of letters, who has established a high court of criticism within himself, from which there is no appeal; will they not blot out the very names of Englishmen from the annals of criticism for ever?

Oh! Sir, had I any talent for that sarcasm and asperity, which you have given me so much credit

credit for, what an extensive field have you opened for the display of it! I might persecute you, as you have me, with all the littleness and impotence of malice, from three-and-sixpenny paragraphs, to four-shilling advertisements; from advertisements to magazines, and from magazines (*pace tant, clariss, virorum*) to REVIEWS*. But again, Sir, I spare you. I know the watchful jealousy with which you guard your literary reputation; and considering the irritable soreness of your mind, I can even PITY you.

I cannot help remarking, that the controversy respecting the *Consolatio*, appears to have been managed in a very singular manner. The utmost that A. Riccoboni, and Janus Gulielmus urged against its authenticity, amounts only to doubts; and the letters which contain their sentiments on the subject, are short, and were written professedly in haste. The most material arguments, in my opinion, are, that the original manuscript was

* As I do not like to speak by HINTS, or by HALVES, I must tell you, I have a very strong SUSPICION, that you furnished the masterly review of the *Vindication* in the *EUROPEAN MAGAZINE*, either directly or indirectly; and also a great part of the account in the *CRITICAL REVIEW*. To the former, your correspondence, as a VOLUNTEER, might be very acceptable; and in the latter, you were entitled to some indulgence on the score of OLD ACQUAINTANCE.

never

never produced*, that I know of, and that all the fragments are inserted precisely in the SAME ORDER in which they had been previously arranged by SIGONIUS. But this amounts only to a doubt, or suspicion; and by no means counteracts the body of evidence which Sigonius in his *Duæ Orationes* has produced in its favor. As to the objections made by Riccoboni and others to the LATINITY, they are of so nice, trifling, and questionable a nature, that little, I think, can be proved from them. The cavils on the use of the words *patria*, *animal*, &c. appear to me frivolous; and as to the passage, "*Neque ego ullo pacto auderem hoc primus prodere, &c.*" Janus Gulielmus certainly misunderstood it.

Lambinus, who is accused of having so far refined on Cicero's style, as to make him more eloquent than himself, raises no objection to the

* Janus Gulielmus called on SIGONIUS to produce it; but it does not appear that he was the FIRST publisher. The printer of the small edition in 1583, at Bologna, says in his address to the reader, "*Vidi opusculum paulò ante Venetiis excusum, sub Titulo M. T. Ciceronis De Consolatione:*" Of course he only REPRINTED it. The book was sent to Sigonius, it seems, for his opinion, who thought it genuine, and in the Bononian Edition, he and Andreas Fabricius performed the parts of Editors. What credit is due to this account of the copy printed, or seen at Venice, I know not. I BELIEVE it is now no where to be found.

Latinity

Latinity of the *Consolatio*, but settles the controversy, as he thinks, by one single argument. It is this; "Cicero se in *Consolatione* testatur collegisse clarissimorum hominum civitatis Romanæ gravissimos exitus: atqui nulli pene hic referuntur." He refers to 2. *Tusc.* et 2. *de Div.* The first reference is wrong; it should be IV. *Tusc.* 29, but he does not profess to have done there, what Lambinus asserts. He is speaking of the mitigation of sorrow, and all the words that refer to the *Consolatio* are "*ægritudinis sedatio explicata est in Consolationis Libro.*" The passage from Lib. II. *De Div.* is, "*Clarissimorum hominum nostræ civitatis gravissimos exitus in Consolatione collegimus.*" He does not say, that he had enumerated ALL, but the most lamentable or severe. Lambinus says, he scarcely mentions any: but I suspect that he only looked at the short passage in the fourth folio page, where Scipio Africanus and Metellus Numidicus are mentioned, with the summary remark, *M. Regulum, C. Marium, L. Brutum, ob liberandam patriam interfectum, PRÆTEREO.* This was all Lambinus saw, or remembered at the time; but if he had read on about three pages farther, he would have found the names of L. Crassus, Pompey, the Decii, Paulus, Marcellus and Albinus.

It

It is remarkable, also, that while Lambinus objects to the authenticity of the *Consolatio*, because the subject of the reference in the second book *de Divinatione* was not to be found, as he supposed, Janus Gulielmus boldly asserts, that the introduction of EVERY fragment and every subject referred to in the works of Cicero, is to him the greatest suspicion of fraud. “*Cetera, ut nihil eorum omitteret quæ apud Ciceronem aut Lactantium dicta sunt de consolatione, facilia, ut etiam ILLUD, ut non incommodè cohærerent partes, et omnia plana et perspicuaque essent. Quod mihi FRAUDIS vel maximam suspicionem movet.*” On the other hand Le Clerc observes,—but it is in vain, Sir, to speak of critics who have the BOLDNESS (this is not the right word) to give a decided opinion of works which they have never read. Let me only add, that if some industrious examiner should find ANOTHER stray fragment preserved in the works of the ancients which does not appear in the *Consolatio* (though I think there is none) it will be no proof of its being spurious, because we find that *DESUNT NONNULLA*—a part is wanting.

It has been said, that the language is evidently not Cicero's, and that some of the sentiments, particularly those on old age, are inconsistent with others, to be found in Cicero's moral works.

works. As to the style, there is an evident reason for its not being so highly polished, and so ostentatiously eloquent, as many of his other books. It was written professedly for private use;—domesticæ subvenire calamitati—and besides, a great part of it is translation. Nor can we suppose that a mind pouring out its sorrows for the loss of such a daughter as Tullia, and labouring for the recovery of peace, would attend much to the rounding of periods, the selection of phrases, or the artful and regular gradation of a climax. Not that the treatise in question is upon the whole deficient in the embellishments of eloquence, or correctness of composition.

It is no proof either of the spuriousness of the *Consolatio*, that it contains some sentiments inconsistent with others to be found in Cicero's works; for he seems to apologize for this very circumstance IV. *Tusc.* 29. "In *Consolationis* libro, quem in medio, non enim SAPIENTES ERAMUS, (says the illustrious orator) mærore et dolore conscripsimus. "But Placcius settles the controversy (like two or three more gentlemen, whose names, Sir, I forbear to repeat) at a stroke; for he says on the authority of Lat. Latinius, that Sigonius a little before his death confessed that the *Consolatio* was written by himself*." Yet

* Confessus (Sigonius, sc.) tandem paulo ante mortem *Consolationem* hanc a seipso compositam esse. Placcius, in *Theat. Pseudon.*

on examining the letter of Lat. Latinus*, which contains this information, you will find the subject premised thus; "*Si verum est quod audio,*"—If what I *hear* be true.—Is not this enough, Sir, to sicken one of critics and criticism?

Another objection to the *Consolatio* is, that the substance of many of the passages is to be found in Cicero's moral pieces, particularly in the *Tusculan Questions*, much better expressed. This appears to me no argument against its genuineness. It is extremely natural to recal sentiments and combinations of ideas that were impressed on the mind by sorrow. They are treasured up in the heart, as the fruits of dear-bought experience; and one conviction derived from that source, is worth a hundred maxims formed merely in the understanding, or borrowed from the schools. It is not at all to be wondered at, therefore, that Cicero should again bring forward a few favourite sentiments that flowed from the heart, in the season of calamity, and adorn them with all the graces of eloquence in those moral treatises which he wrote AFTER the *Consolatio*.

Lipsius calls the whole treatise LEAD; and contrasts it with the fragments in Lactantius, that the reader may observe the difference between it; and the Ciceronian GOLD; but I do not hesitate

* Ap. Placcium, ubi supra.

to say, that there are many parts of the *Consolatio* superior in every respect to any of the fragments, except ONE: I mean that beginning with “*Animorum nulla in terris origio inveniri potest. Nihil,*” &c. But this is not disgraced either by the sentiments or language that precede and follow it. The whole page is pure Gold, and truly worthy of CICERO.

Do, Sir, let me prevail on you to READ this excellent composition, and particularly attend to the author's estimate of the miseries of life in different stations—the comfort to be derived from philosophy—the character of his daughter—and the arguments in proof of the immortality of the soul.

After what I have advanced on this subject, you will guess to which side my opinion leans: but I am not certain, Sir, that you have not inspired me with something like a passion for VINDICATION, and an uncommon share of suspicion with regard to professed DOUBTERS. However, I do not pretend, like some gentlemen who have gone before me, to SETTLE the controversy; or to affirm that the *Consolatio* is the genuine production of Cicero. I will only say, for MYSELF, that I cannot discover any clear PROOF of its being a forgery; nor can I fix upon one of your great men in the sixteenth century, whom I think capable of writing

E

such

such an essay, ALL circumstances considered. Had there been no suspicion with regard to its being genuine, and the same trifling imperfections found in it as some are supposed to have discovered, I am convinced that LAMBINUS, and a few more, would immediately have corrected them, as errors arising from the oscitancy of transcribers, and substituted, as they have frequently done, what they imagined Cicero ought to have written. The chief reasons for ascribing it to Sigonius were, 1. His having collected the fragments of the *Consolatio* with great diligence, and their being introduced in the order in which he arranged them. 2. His writing the best Latin, perhaps, of any man then living. Lat. Latinus boldly says, “*Jurejurando etiam contenderem unius Sigonii tantum id scriptum esse potuisse.*” 3. His appearing so zealous in its defence, will be thought an argument by some, perhaps; but he died soon after, in the same year that he published his *Dux Orationes*, and left the field of controversy in the possession of his opponents; yet there needs no other reason to shew the weakness of their cause, than the circumstance of the *Consolatio* being ascribed with equal probability, perhaps, by H. Ernestus to Car. Vianelli, a Venetian.

I am now happy, Sir, to take my leave of you. There are indeed, a few aspersions which you
have

have thrown out, not connected with the subject of our controversy, nor with any of your struggles for victory; but they are so truly despicable and mean, that I cannot CONDESCEND to notice them; and should ever the hour of calm reflection return, I have some hope that you will think them unworthy of yourself.

In publishing this letter, I was chiefly concerned to point out the TRUTH, JUSTICE, and above all, the CANDOR of your late criticisms; that the reader, who has not the patience to follow you as I have done, might be enabled to judge of FUTURE communications from the PAST. Should any one be disposed to censure me for what I have written, let him first enquire who threw the first stone, and how far it is a duty which a man owes himself, to repel the attacks of hostile insolence, and to expose the misrepresentations of ignorance or malice, when they have a direct tendency to injure him in his profession, and to render him contemptible in the eyes of those who know him not, and who can judge only from the reports of others.

Notwithstanding I am satisfied that in writing these pages, I have discharged a DUTY, yet I freely acknowledge it has been a PAINFUL one. However it is passed; and I wish to forget the subject which gave rise to it for ever. I need

not

not fear, indeed, that it will be long remembered, or generally known. It is hastening to oblivion, before it has well seen the light. Yes, Sir, the controversy between us is almost as DEAD as if it had NEVER BEEN; and I am happy to find that the Parian Chronicle rests precisely on the same grounds of authenticity, that it has always done. This, therefore, is ANOTHER motive with me, for closing all further correspondence between us; since you know, that, "Cum mortuis non nisi larvas luctari." Give me leave to conclude, by assuring you, that I think, I HAVE been, on various occasions,

SIR,

Your very HUMBLE servant,

Oct. 13, 1789.

JOHN HEWLETT.

